BS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,246	01/24/2002	Shelia Jean Burgess	625269-012	8961

29391 7590 10/19/2004

BEUSSE BROWNLEE WOLTER MORA & MAIRE, P. A.
390 NORTH ORANGE AVENUE
SUITE 2500
ORLANDO, FL 32801

EXAMINER	
PEREZ, ANGELICA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	3

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/056,246	BURGESS, SHELIA JEAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Angelica M. Perez	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: for every one claim, there should be only one period limiting it. In claim 13 of the application, there is an extra period. E.g., "...an incoming communication is permitted. Upon this time limit being exceeded...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tatchell (Tatchell et al.; US Patent No.: 6,160,877 A).

Regarding claim 27, Tatchell teaches of a method for processing incoming communication sent to a communications device of a receiving party (column 14, lines 60-62; e.g., "regular (basic) call processing"; see also the title, "Method of Screening and Prioritizing an Incoming Call"), the method comprising the steps of:

storing at least one of a plurality of originating source criteria (column 9, lines 25-28; e.g., "contact database"); storing at least one of a plurality of time criteria (figure 5b, column 7; e.g., "always" and "9-5 only"); and storing at least one of a plurality of associated relative classification criteria (figure 5b; where the categories represent different classification criteria), for classifying an incoming communication as a function of at least one of source and time (column 3; "CLID" where it represents a source criteria. Examiner selected "source criteria" from the options provided by applicant).

Regarding claim 28, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Tatchell further teaches where the receiving party communications device possesses at least one of a plurality of device states (column 8, lines 43-56; where the states can be "off-hook" and "on-hook") where the device state determines current associative device functions (column 8, lines 43-56; where the off-hook is associated with a calling party immediately receiving dial tone).

Regarding claim 29, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 28. Tatchell further teaches where the device state can be designated as mode of operation (column 8, lines 43-56; where the off-hook is associated with a calling party immediately receiving dial tone. Also, the mode of operation corresponds to "basic", "standard" or "regular" mode of operation).

Regarding claim 34, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Tatchell further teaches where the storing of originating source criteria further includes storing an associated outgoing message (OGM) (columns 18 and 19, lines 61-67 and 1-

13; where different messages are stored, to be played, according to specific calling parties).

Regarding claim 35, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 34. Tatchell further teaches of receiving incoming communication from a particular originating source (column 18, lines 60-61; e.g., "incoming calls"); and playing the OGM to the particular originating source when the originating source is matched (columns 18 and 19, lines 61-67 and 1-13; where different messages are stored, to be played, according to specific calling parties).

Regarding claim 36, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Tatchell further teaches where the storing of originating source criteria further includes storing an associated announcement or pre-selected user notification such as a ring pattern (column 22, lines 1-8; e.g., "specified ring").

Regarding claim 37, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Tatchell further teaches of receiving incoming communication from a particular originating source (column 18, lines 60-61; e.g., "incoming calls"); and playing the announcement or a notification to the user when the originating source is matched by the receiving party's communications device and the time criteria are satisfied (columns 18 and 19, lines 61-67 and 1-13; where different messages are stored, to be played, according to specific calling parties).

3. Claims 41-43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gaechter (Gaechter et al.; US Patent No.: 5,463,685 A).

Regarding claim 41, Gaechter teaches of a method for the user rating a communication (column 1, lines 15-22) comprising of the following steps of: establishing a communication link type (column 2, lines 39-44; where the link type is "long distance"); establishing the communication source identification (figure 3, page 3; customer information corresponds to "identification information"; column 4, lines 25-29; e.g., "the identity of the phone numbers..."); the user receiving the communication (column 1, lines 57-59; where the user receives an outbound connection); the user providing feedback criteria on how much they liked the communication (column 1, lines 18-22; where the user is surveyed to determine customer satisfaction); and storing the user provided feedback criteria for future use (column 1, lines 18-22; where the purpose of surveys is to use it as reference for future services).

Regarding claim 42, Gaechter teaches all the limitations according to claim 41. Gaechter further teaches where the communication link type is selected from the group comprising: a voice type; an internet content type; a video type; a multimedia type; a fax type; and a broadcast media type (column 5, lines columns 24-28; where the examiner has selected "voice type" from the choices provided).

Regarding claim 43, Gaechter teaches all the limitations according to claim 41. Gaechter further teaches the communication source identification is selected from the group comprising: a voice communication identity; an internet protocol identity; a video source identifier; a multimedia identifier; a fax identifier; and a broadcast media identifier (column 5, lines columns 24-28; where the examiner has selected "voice type" from the choices provided).

Regarding claim 45, Gaechter teaches all the limitations according to claim 41. Gaechter further teaches where the feedback criteria is a relative priority rating (column 1, lines 18-22; where surveys rate according to relative priorities such as: good, excellent, bad or very bad. Where a high priority rating can be excellent and low priority rating can be bad or very bad).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 14, 20, 22-23, 26 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Redd (Reed et al.: US Patent No.: 5,467,388 A).

Regarding claim 1, Tatchell teaches of a method for processing an incoming communication from a calling party sent to a communications device 1014 of a receiving party (column 14, lines 60-62; e.g., "regular (basic) call processing"; see also the title, "Method of Screening and Prioritizing an Incoming Call"), the method comprising the steps of: storing a caller database including a plurality of records (column 9, lines 25-28; e.g., "contact database"), each record including caller identification information corresponding to a particular caller (column 9, lines 25-28; e.g., "contact names, telephone numbers, categories and call screening information") and a respective

priority selected from a plurality of priorities (column 18, lines 55-60; e.g., "by priority assigned to the name in the contact database and by number dialed"). Tatchell further teaches of a database including a plurality of records respectively corresponding to the plurality of priorities and including respective blocking information for each priority (column 19, lines 13-19; where the "block message is applied according to a priority setting for each caller or group of callers"; columns 18 and 19, lines 55-67 and 1-26, respectively) In addition, Tatchel teaches of specific allocated times for each priority (figure 5b, column 7; e.g., "always" and "9-5 only").

Tatchell does not specifically teach of specific times for blocking calls.

In related art, concerning a method and apparatus for selectively blocking incoming telephone calls, Redd teaches of specific times for blocking calls (e.g., " the subscriber might select a time period (in hours and minutes) or ranges of time (start times and end times) in which selective call blocking will be in effect"; columns 5 and 6, lines 66-67 and 1-2, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's method for processing an incoming communication with priority based call blocking feature with Redd's selective call blocking periods in order for the user to avoid receiving nuisance calls at an inconvenient time, as taught by Redd.

Regarding claim 15, Tatchell teaches of a communications system for processing incoming communications which include caller identification information (column 3, lines 23-32), the system comprising: a caller identification device 1003 for receiving the

incoming communication and extracting caller identification information from the incoming communication (figure 5b, column 3, "CLID" which corresponds to a "caller line identification"); a user communications device 1014 for receiving and providing an incoming communication to a user of the communications device (figure 8c; where the telephone is provided with incoming communication; e.g., "Normal ring", "Distinctive ring"); a communications controller 1013 coupled between the caller identification device and the user communications device (figure 3, item 30; where the controller functions as an intermediary between the communications device, switching center, databases and caller line identification), the controller including: a processor 1006 for executing code to control the transmission of incoming communications to the user communications device (figure 3, item 30; where inherently processors process computer functions that involve procedure code, data storage and interfacing); a memory 1007, 1008 for storing code for execution by the processor to control the transmission of incoming communications to the communications device (column s 11 and 12, lines 66-67 and 1-14; e.g., "multiple databases used by the Personal Agent to treat outgoing and incoming calls according to the predetermined profiles of subscribers"), the code including a caller database including a plurality of records (column 9, lines 25-28; e.g., "contact database"), each record including caller identification information corresponding to a particular caller (column 9, lines 25-28; e.g., "contact names, telephone numbers, categories and call screening information") and a respective priority selected from a plurality of priorities (column 18, lines 55-60; e.g., "by priority assigned to the name in the contact database and by number dialed").

Tatchell further teaches of code including a plurality of records respectively corresponding to the plurality of priorities and including respective blocking information for each priority (column 19, lines 13-19; where the "block message is applied according to a priority setting for each caller or group of callers"; columns 18 and 19, lines 55-67 and 1-26, respectively). In addition, Tatchel teaches of specific allocated times for each priority (figure 5b, column 7; e.g., "always" and "9-5 only").

Tatchell does not specifically teach of specific times for blocking calls.

In related art, concerning a method and apparatus for selectively blocking incoming telephone calls, Redd teaches of specific times for blocking calls (e.g., " the subscriber might select a time period (in hours and minutes) or ranges of time (start times and end times) in which selective call blocking will be in effect"; columns 5 and 6, lines 66-67 and 1-2, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's method for processing an incoming communication with priority based call blocking feature with Redd's selective call blocking periods in order for the user to avoid receiving nuisance calls at an inconvenient time, as taught by Redd.

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively. Tatchell further teaches the step of selecting, by the user, the respective priority stored in the caller database for particular callers whose identification information is stored in (column 16, lines 37-47; e.g., "The subscriber can also add names, numbers...If applicable, a contact priority table as well

as screening or call disposition ...The categories, screening and call disposition tables can be modified by the subscriber as required").

Regarding claim 7, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 1. Tatchell further teaches where the identification information depends on the identity of the communication device of the calling party (column 1, lines 29-32; e.g., "Calling Number...Identification...number of the caller...").

Regarding claim 8, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 1. Tatchell further teaches where the identification information depends on the telephone number of the calling party (column 1, lines 29-32; e.g., "Calling Number...Identification...number of the caller...").

Regarding claims 10 and 23, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively. Tatchell further teaches where the identification information depends on the identity of the calling party (column 1, lines 29-32; e.g., "Calling Name...Identification...name of the caller...").

Regarding claims 14 and 26, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively. Tatchell further teaches of comprising the step of: storing an outgoing message (OGM) mapped to the caller identification information in a record of the caller database for a particular calling party (columns 18 and 19, lines 61-67 and 1-13; where the different callers will receive a message according to their identification information); receiving an incoming communication from the particular calling party (column 18, lines 60-61; e.g., "incoming calls"); and playing the outgoing message to the particular calling party when the calling party's

identification information is detected by the communications device (columns 18 and 19, lines 61-67 and 1-13; where the different callers will receive a message according to their identification information).

Regarding claims 9 and 22. Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively. Redd further teaches where the identification information depends on the IP address of the calling party (column 6, lines 62-64; e.g., "virtual number" corresponding to an "IP address").

Regarding claim 38, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27.

Tatchell does not specifically teach where an emergency operation is executed upon a determination of an emergency condition by the receiving party's communication device per the receiving party's pre-selected device operation.

In related art, concerning a method and apparatus for selectively blocking incoming telephone calls, Redd teaches where an emergency operation is executed upon a determination of an emergency condition by the receiving party's communication device per the receiving party's pre-selected device operation (column 6, lines 16-24; where the user pre-selects the emergency blocking exception).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's method for processing an incoming communication with priority based call blocking feature with Redd's emergency condition in order to be able to receive emergency calls, as taught by Redd.

Regarding claim 39, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 38. Redd further teaches of receiving and storing incoming communication

emergency indication (column 6, lines 44-46); reading the emergency indication; retrieving receiving party's communication device operation to be executed upon an emergency condition indication (column 6, lines 46-50); and invoking the designated device operation to be executed upon an emergency condition indication (column 6, lines 50-51).

Regarding claim 40, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 39. Redd further teaches of receiving and decoding DTMF inputs from incoming communication source to indicate an emergency condition (column 12, lines 7-12).

6. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Brown (Brown, James L.; US Patent No.: 5,060,255).

Regarding claim 30, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Tatchell further teaches of receiving an incoming communication including caller identification information (column 21, lines 37-39; where the "calling line ID" corresponds to the "caller identification information).

Tatchell does not specifically teach of reading call time data to determine the time that the incoming communication is received to provide a call received time.

In related art, concerning a telecommunications system with time-do-not-disturb feature, Brown teaches of reading call time data to determine the time that the incoming communication is received to provide a call received time (column 6, lines 43-52; where the time is required in order to apply an appropriate response).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's method with Brown's time check in order to follow the appropriate pre-set procedures, as taught by Brown.

Regarding claim 31, Tatchell in view of Brown teaches all the limitations of claim 30. Tatchell further teaches the steps of searching the stored originating source criteria to find a match of the incoming communication originating source criteria (column 17, lines 21-26; e.g., "...match the incoming CLID of callers to the subscriber's contact data entries"); retrieving associated relative classification criteria for the match to provide a relative classification (column 9, lines 16-20; where different categories are stored and matched to provide the appropriate response); searching the associated time criteria of the incoming communication associated with the retrieved relative classification to determine the time management functions to be used for the present incoming communication (time is included in the criteria, see table 5b in page 7, column 7; e.g., "9-5 only", "always"); reading the present device state (columns 9 and 10; lines 64-67 and 1-35 where the user is off-hook and the handling of the call is done according to the criteria established by the user); and processing relative classification criteria and the associated time management functions to provide the functional operation to be performed by the communications device of the receiving party for the present device state (column 10, lines 18-21).

7. Claims 2-4, 6, 16-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Redd as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brown (Brown, James L.; US Patent No.: 5,060,255).

Regarding claim 2, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 1. Tatchell further teaches of receiving an incoming communication including caller identification information (column 21, lines 37-39; where the "calling line ID" corresponds to the "caller identification information).

Tatchell in view of Redd does not specifically teach of reading call time data to determine the time that the incoming communication is received to provide a call received time.

In related art, concerning a telecommunications system with time-do-not-disturb feature, Brown teaches of reading call time data to determine the time that the incoming communication is received to provide a call received time (column 6, lines 43-52; where the time is required in order to apply an appropriate response).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's and Redd's combined method with Brown's time check in order to follow the appropriate pre-set procedures, as taught by Brown.

Regarding claim 3, Tatchell in view of Redd and further in view of Brown teaches all the limitations according to claim 2. Tatchell further teaches the steps of searching the caller database to find a record having caller identification information matching the caller identification information of the incoming communication (column 17, lines 21-26; e.g., "...match the incoming CLID of callers to the subscriber's contact data entries")

and retrieving the respective priority for that record to produce a retrieved priority (column 21, lines 24-27; "call screening and prioritization parameters are verified"); Tatchel teaches of specific allocated times for each priority (figure 5b, column 7; e.g., "always" and "9-5 only"). However, Redd better teaches of searching the blocking time database to determine blocking time information associated with the retrieved priority to produce retrieved blocking time information (e.g., " the subscriber might select a time period (in hours and minutes) or ranges of time (start times and end times) in which selective call blocking will be in effect"; columns 5 and 6, lines 66-67 and 1-2, respectively).

Regarding claim 4, Tatchell in view of Redd and further in view of Brown teaches all the limitations according to claim 3. Tatchell further teaches the steps of comparing the call received time of the incoming communication with the retrieved blocking time information (column 13, lines 29-44; where inherently in order to block the call at a determined time, the code requires to compare the thresholds/times); blocking the incoming communication if the call received time occurs during a block out time indicated by the retrieved blocking time information (column 13, lines 35-38; e.g., "from 5:00 PM to 10:00 PM... blocking out telemarketers"; according to tier 3) and otherwise permitting the incoming communication to be routed to the user of the communications device (column 13, lines 35-38; e.g., "from 5:00 PM to 10:00 PM...allow calls from friends" according enabled tier 3).

Regarding claims 6 and 21, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively. Tatchell further teaches of comprising the

step of selecting, by the user, the respective blocking time information for the priorities stored in the blocking time database (table 5b, column 7, e.g., "9-5 only", "always"). Brown further teaches of specific blocking times (column 6, lines 43-52; where the time is required in order to apply an appropriate response).

Regarding claim 16, Tatchell in view of Redd and further in view of Brown teaches all the limitations according to claim 15. Tatchell further teaches where the code includes a caller database search routine which when executed by the processor searches the caller database in RAM memory 1007 (figure 3, item 30; where inherently processors process computer functions that involve procedure code, data storage and interfacing. The examples show where stored data can be changed by the user implying the utilization of a RAM memory. Where, one of the fundamental characteristic of RAM memory is that it can be overwritten) to find a record having caller identification information matching the caller identification information of an incoming communication (column 17, lines 21-26; e.g., "...match the incoming CLID of callers to the subscriber's contact data entries") and retrieves the respective priority for that record to produce a retrieved priority (column 21, lines 24-27; "call screening and prioritization parameters are verified").

Regarding claim 17, Tatchell in view of Redd and further in view of Brown teaches all the limitations according to claim 16. Tatchel teaches of specific allocated times for each priority (figure 5b, column 7; e.g., "always" and "9-5 only"). However, Redd also teaches where the code further includes a blocking time database search routine which when executed by the processor determines blocking time information

associated with the retrieved priority to produce retrieved blocking time information (e.g., " the subscriber might select a time period (in hours and minutes) or ranges of time (start times and end times) in which selective call blocking will be in effect"; columns 5 and 6, lines 66-67 and 1-2, respectively).

Regarding claim 18, Tatchell in view of Redd and further in view of Brown teaches all the limitations according to claim 17. Tatchell further teaches where the code further includes a compare routine for comparing the time of the incoming communication with the retrieved blocking time information (column 13, lines 29-44; where inherently in order to block the call at a determined time, the code requires to compare the thresholds/times).

Regarding claim 19, Tatchell in view of Redd and further in view of Brown teaches all the limitations according to claim 18. Tatchell further teaches where the code further includes a blocking routine for blocking the incoming communication if the time of the incoming communication occurs at a blocking time indicated by the retrieved blocking time information (column 13, lines 35-38; e.g., "from 5:00 PM to 10:00 PM... blocking out telemarketers"; according to tier 3) and otherwise permitting the incoming communication to be routed to the user communications device (column 13, lines 35-38; e.g., "from 5:00 PM to 10:00 PM...allow calls from friends" according enabled tier 3).

8. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Redd as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lim (Lim US Patent No.: 5,883,942 A).

Regarding claims 11 and 24, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively.

Tatchell in view of Redd does not specifically teach of storing a silence mode relative blocking time in the communications device; and blocking incoming communications for the communications device temporarily while the silence mode relative blocking time is in effect (column 9, lines 37-47; "silently reject").

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's and Redd's combined method with Lim's silent rejection in order to silently reject an incoming call to avoid disruptions, as taught by Lim.

9. Claims 12 –13, 25 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Redd as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brown (Brown et al.; US Patent No.: 5,535,261 A)

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claims 1 and 15, respectively.

Tatchell in view of Redd does not specifically teach of storing a frequency field in a record of the caller database to set a limit to the number of times an incoming communication is permitted during a selected time period from the particular calling party associated with that record.

In related art, concerning selectively activated integrated real-time recording of telephone conversations, Brown teaches of storing a frequency field in a record of the

caller database to set a limit to the number of times an incoming communication is permitted during a selected time period from the particular calling party associated with that record (columns 19 and 20, lines 47-67 and 47-66).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tatchell's and Redd's combined method with Brown's number of allowed call attempts in order to reduce fraudulent use of the telephone system, as taught by Brown.

Regarding claim 13, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 1. Brown further teaches where storing a duration field in a record of the caller database to set a limit to the amount of time an incoming communication is permitted (column 19, lines 51-57). Upon this time limit being exceeded, an indication such as a beep will be invoked (column 20, lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 32, Tatchell teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Brown further teaches in which the storing of originating source criteria further includes storing associated frequency criteria to set a limit to the number of times an incoming communication is permitted during a selected time period from the associated originating source (columns 19 and 20, lines 47-67 and 47-66).

Regarding claim 33, Tatchell in view of Redd teaches all the limitations according to claim 27. Brown further teaches where storing a duration field in a record of the caller database to set a limit to the amount of time an incoming communication is permitted (column 19, lines 51-57) and providing an indication when the set time limit is exceeded (column 20, lines 5-10).

10. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaechter in view of Tatchell.

Regarding claim 44, Gaechter teaches all the limitations according to claim 43.

Gaechter does not specifically teach where the communication source identification for a voice communication identity is selected from the group comprising: a caller identity; or a calling device identity.

In related art, comprising a network based outbound call management, Gaechter teaches where the communication source identification for a voice communication identity is selected from the group comprising: a caller identity; or a calling device identity (column 9, lines 25-28; e.g., "contact names, telephone numbers" correspond to caller identity or calling device identity).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gaechte's survey method with Tatchell's communication identity in order to identify the origin of a call, as taught by Tatchell.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 703-305-8724. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:15 a.m. - 3:55 p.m., Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Information regarding Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system can be found at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.

Angelica Perez
(Examiner)

NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit 2684

October 7, 2004